

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 23 2007

Attorney Docket No. AUS920030685US1
Serial No. 10/682,402
Response to Office Action mailed January 23, 2007

II. REMARKS

1. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101. Examiner rejected claims 1-6 and 31 due to being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended the claims to address the 101 rejections.
2. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). The examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-30, as being anticipated by Kung (US 2003/0196108). Kung provides security for a data object by providing a security label for the data object ([0007], lines 2-4). Kung requires a firewall for each local area network. See FIG. 1, 40a, 40b, and 40c and [0025], [0026] and [0027]. Applicant, on the other hand, allows an administrator to create a plurality of virtual firewalls from a single firewall. Applicant has amended the independent claims to more particularly point out this distinction. For example, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “wherein only the firewall is used to protect each of the plurality of Virtual Local Area Networks in accordance with a designated trust level.” Support for the amendment is found in the specification in at least paragraph [0010]. Applicant submits that this use of a single firewall rather than a firewall for each network is novel and distinguishes over the prior art.
3. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The examiner rejected claims 3, 11, 31-32 as being unpatentable over Kung in view of Taylor (US 6,728,885). Applicant distinguishes over Kung for the same reasons set forth above.
4. Applicant submits that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Attorney Docket No. AUS920030685US1
Serial No. 10/682,402
Response to Office Action mailed January 23, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Rudolf O. Siegesmund

Rudolf O. Siegesmund
Registration No. 37,720
Gordon & Rees LLP
Suite 2650
2100 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75201
214-461-4050
214-461-4053 (fax)
rsiegesmund@gordonrees.com